EXHIBIT 12

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 1

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
2	SAN ANTONIO DIVISION
3	LA UNION DEL PUEBLO § ENTERO, ET AL., §
4	Plaintiffs, S Civil Action No. S 5:21-cv-844 (XR)
5	VS. § (Consolidated Cases)
6	STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL. §
7	Defendants. § ************************************
8	ORAL DEPOSITION OF
9	JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE
10	APRIL 27, 2022
11	
12	*************
13	ORAL DEPOSITION OF JONATHAN SHERMAN WHITE,
14	produced as a witness at the instance of the Plaintiffs
15	and Plaintiff-Intervenors, and duly sworn, was taken in
16	the above-styled and numbered cause on the 27th day of
17	April 2022, from 9:11 a.m. to 5:31 p.m., before Caroline
18	Chapman, CSR in and for the State of Texas, reported by
19	Computerized Stenotype Machine, Computer-Assisted
20	Transcription, held at the William P. Clements Jr. State
21	Office Building, 300 West 15th Street, Hearing Room
22	1001E, Austin, Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of
23	Civil Procedure.
24	
25	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 128

128

specific elements	5.
-------------------	----

- Let's turn forward now to 4.09(a), which is on Page 29.
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Here would you agree with me that Section 33.061(a) already describes an offense related to preventing a watcher from observing?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. And would you agree with me that there is new language now brought in my SB 1 that makes it an offense to take any action to obstruct the view of a watcher distance the watcher from the activity or procedure to be observed in a manner that would make observation not reasonably effective?
 - A. Yes, ma'am. That's what it says.
- 16 In this language here, starting at Line 8, where it says "taking any action," you would understand that to mean it could be any one of a number of 18 19 different types of action, right? Action is not defined here, but it says "any action," you agree?
 - I would agree that "action" is not defined.
 - It also says "any action," doesn't it?
 - Yes, ma'am, it does.
 - Q. Do you know what action would obstruct the view
- 25 of a watcher?

128 Jonathan Sherman White

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 129

1	MR. HUDSON: Objection, form, foundation.
2	Objection, calls for speculation.
3	A. I don't know what that that action would be.
4	Could be anything, I suppose.
5	Q. Okay. Do you know what action would be to
6	distance the watcher from the activity or procedure?
7	MR. HUDSON: Same objections.
8	A. I don't. I don't have a list of examples of
9	that off the top of my head, no, ma'am.
10	Q. Do you know what would do you know what
11	would constitute a manner that would make observation
12	not reasonably effective?
13	MR. HUDSON: Same objections.
14	A. No. We would we would take a set of facts
15	that we were given in a complaint and then we would try
16	to apply the law, and I don't typically work in reverse.
17	Q. Have you developed any standards at this point
18	for deciding what would be an action that would obstruct
19	the view of a watcher?
20	A. No, ma'am.
21	Q. Have you developed any standards that would
22	allow you to decide whether a poll official had
23	distanced the watcher from the activity?
24	MR. HUDSON: I'll just remind you of the
25	running objection that we have concerning privileges,

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 131

131

1 s	can it at the door on your way out.
2	Q. Okay. So generally you vote on a machine that
3 h	as a screen and it's sitting on a little table with
4 s	ome long legs on it; is that right?
5	A. Yes, ma'am.
6	Q. Okay. And then you're going to take the piece
7 o	f paper that it gives you, and you're going to walk
8 0	ver to that receptacle and put your piece of paper in
9 t	nere; is that right?
10	A. Yes, ma'am. Place it in the receptacle.
11	Q. Okay. Sometimes called a tabulator. Okay. So
12	et's take the instance of a voter who is standing at
13 0	ne of those voting machines like the kind that you vote
14 0	n, Mr. White. How close let me ask the question
15 t	nis way. How far could a watcher be placed by the
16 e	lection judge such that it would violate Section
17 4	.09(a) in SB 1?
18	MR. HUDSON: Objection. Incomplete
19 h	ypothetical. Objection, calls for speculation.
20	A. I don't think I could answer that.
21	Q. Is it because you don't know?
22	A. I couldn't
23	MR. HUDSON: Objection, calls for an
24 ir	complete hypothetical. Calls for speculation.
25	A. Yeah. I don't have enough facts to to

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 132

1	answer that question. And even if I did have enough
2	facts, it would probably involve me going into my
3	thought processes about about the offense, and so I
4	don't think I could answer that.
5	Q. Okay. At this point, I would like to say on
6	the record that you should listen to your counsel, and
7	especially if he instructs you not to answer the
8	question. But counsel is limited to making form
9	objections and not speaking objections. And so in order
10	to avoid any appearance of coaching the witness, which I
11	know counsel would never do, his form objections
12	MR. HUDSON: Well, I'll just go ahead and
13	stop you right there and say you're tossing out coaching
14	on the record. Nobody is coaching by giving form and
15	giving the description of what the objection is, which
16	I've been limiting to one word. We also have a standing
17	objection, our standing or running objection based on
18	privileges. And I would point out that some of your
19	questions are clearly targeted at getting at privileged
20	information, so I'm simply reminding the witness of the
21	stipulation that you made early on so that I wouldn't
22	give long objections based on privilege.
23	If you want me to go ahead and start
24	making all formal objections because you're concerned
25	that I'm giving speaking objections, I'm happy to do

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 133

133

1	that. I'm just trying to make sure that my client isn't
2	reaching out and expanding beyond the privilege
3	stipulation that we've already made.
4	MS. PERALES: You have your running
5	stipulation, and we've agreed to that. I just want to
6	make sure that the form objections are stated as
7	succinctly as the rules hope we do.
8	Q. (By Ms. Perales) So let's go back to the
9	voting machine scenario. Mr. White, you're familiar
10	with your own voting machine that you use in the polling
11	place in your home county. If we have a situation where
12	there's a watcher and a voter, and an election judge,
13	and the election judge has distanced the watcher from
14	that machine and the activity of the voter at that
15	machine, is it your testimony that that that is still
16	not enough information upon which you could make a
17	decision whether there is a violation of 4.09 of SB 1?
18	MR. HUDSON: Objection, speculation.
19	Incomplete hypothetical.
20	A. I think that's correct, that I wouldn't have
21	enough information.
22	Q. Could you explain to me how this new language
23	in 4.09(a) makes unlawful behavior that previously would
24	have been lawful?
25	A. I would say the plain text that was added adds

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 136

1	something that had actually happened rather than coming
2	up with examples of what might potentially violate a
3	code.
4	Q. Do you have an idea of the degree to which the
5	watcher's subjective perception of whether they have
6	been distanced or obstructed would play a role in
7	whether or not there's a violation of Section 4.09?
8	MR. HUDSON: Objection, calls for
9	speculation. Improper and incomplete hypothetical.
10	A. I would say, from a legal perspective, when we
11	talk about that uses the language "not reasonably
12	effective," a reasonable standard would be applied. So
13	normally in the law it would be an objectively
14	reasonable standard or reasonable person, not this
15	specific individual and what they thought was
16	reasonable, but what is the reasonable and objective
17	standard. And so I believe that's what that's what
18	is implemented in the new language of Subsection A.
19	Q. And so if it is a reasonable person standard,
20	are you comfortable sharing with me what your thought is
21	about a distance of the watcher from an activity at a
22	voting machine that would be reasonable or unreasonable?
23	A. No, I don't think I would.
24	Q. Let's flip forward to Section 6.4. That starts
25	on Page 52.

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 169

1	Q. Okay. So let's get the ballot in the picture
2	then. The voter is engaging with me. I am talking
3	about this clear clean air measure. I know
4	that the voter has the mail ballot there because the
5	voter says, "I have the mail ballot right here, it's on
6	the table inside the door," or "It's right over there on
7	the kitchen table," the ballot is in the picture. And I
8	am telling you that I am urging this voter to vote for
9	the clean air measure because I want this voter to vote
10	for the clean air measure, okay? So I'm there, I'm
11	standing in the voter's door. The voter is there, the
12	mail ballot is there, and I am telling you I am
13	saying to this voter, "Look, I am telling you, we want
14	to vote for this because it's important; I want you to
15	vote." And it's my job going door-to-door to make sure
16	that people vote for this clean air measure. I'm
17	exhorting the voter at that point.
18	MR. HUDSON: Same objection.
19	A. Yeah.
20	Q. Am I running afoul of 7.04?
21	A. 7.04 being the well, it's the section that
22	contains the statute. The vote harvesting statute, we
23	haven't even gotten to.
24	Q. The compensation. Okay. So let me rephrase
25	the question. Am I vote harvesting? Am I committing

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 170

170

1	vote harvesting services as set out in Paragraph 2
2	starting at Line 7, Page 59?
3	A. Well, I think it may be unclear whether or not
4	the definition of vote harvesting services has been
5	actually triggered or not, and again, the the actual
6	involvement of the ballot is kind of one of the nebulous
7	issues in your hypothetical, but, also we haven't even
8	gotten to an offense yet.
9	Q. Uh-huh.
0	A. So the offense language, while it involves vote
1	harvesting services, that's merely an element in the
2	several offenses in this section, as well, and then
3	there's kind of a safe harbor set of provisions as well
4	that explain what the section does not apply to, so
5	Q. Understood. And the reason that I'm taking
6	this in pieces is because 7.04, the offense of vote
7	harvesting is itself made up of elements which are
8	themselves made up of elements. So vote harvesting is
9	an element of the offense, and so I'm hoping to get a
0	clear understanding of what vote harvesting services
1	means in the context of my hypothetical, because then I
2	want to move on to other questions.
23	Are you are you saying that, if I tell
24	you that the ballot is on a table inside the door or the
25	hallot is in view on a kitchen table that you're

Entero v Texas NATIONAL COURT REPORTERS INC 888.800.9656

Jonathan Sherman White 233

233

1	this?
2	MR. HUDSON: Yeah. We'll ask for a
3	24-hour turnaround on ours. Is that no good? You're
4	squinting
5	THE REPORTER: There is no way I can do
6	that. I'm sorry.
7	MR. HUDSON: Okay. Why don't we go off
8	the record and we can talk about the timing on it.
9	(Deposition concluded.)
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

4/27/2022 National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656 Page: 233